

REMARKS

Applicant and the undersigned thank Examiner Bates for the careful review of this application. Reconsideration of the present application in light of the above-amendments to the claims and in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-36 were previously pending.

Claims 1-10 and 19-36 have been rejected.

Claims 11-18 have been allowed.

Claims 33 and 34 have been canceled.

Claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 9, 19, 21-28, 30-32, 35 and 36 have been amended.

Claims 2, 3, 5, 8, 10-18, 20 and 29 have been maintained in their previously-presented form.

Claims 37-45 have been added.

Claims 1-32 and 35-45 are now pending.

Applicant respectfully requests that the above amendments be entered, and further requests reconsideration in light of the amendments and remarks contained herein. Support for these amendments may be found throughout the specification.

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

The Examiner argues that Applicant's submission of an extraordinarily large IDS allegedly does not properly satisfy one's duty of disclosure under 37 C.F.R. §1.56(a). Additionally, Examiner requests that Applicant correct any error which Applicant may become aware of in the IDS.

Applicant has disclosed all information that Applicant believes to be material towards patentability, as required by 37 C.F.R. §1.56(a). Thus, Applicant has satisfied the requirements of 37 C.F.R. §1.56(a). Applicant is not aware of any additional

requirements that limit the information, or the number of documents, which Applicant can disclose. Additionally, Applicant is unaware of any errors in the IDS, but will correct any errors which Applicant subsequently becomes aware of in the IDS.

SPECIFICATION

The Examiner objected to the content of the abstract of the disclosure as allegedly being too short and lacking the proper content.

Applicants have traversed this objection by amending the Abstract of the Disclosure to conform with the requirements.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(b) AND 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-10 and 19-36 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Smalley et al. (US 6,142,230) ("Smalley"). Additionally, the Examiner rejected claims 1 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Freeman et al. (US 6,263,968) ("Freeman").

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of claims 1-10 and 19-36 for at least the following reasons. Applicants' amended independent claims 1 and 6 recite in relevant part, "... radially expanding and plastically deforming the second wellbore casing within the borehole so that the second wellbore casing comprises a first configuration in which the inside diameter of the overlapping portion of the second wellbore casing is less than the inside diameter of the portion of the first wellbore casing that does not overlap with the second wellbore casing ... [and] ... radially expanding and plastically deforming at least a portion of the second wellbore casing that does not overlap with the first wellbore casing so that the second wellbore casing comprises a second configuration in which the inside diameter of the overlapping portion and the at least a portion of the second wellbore casing is equal to the inside diameter of the portion of the first wellbore casing that does not overlap with the second wellbore casing."

However, it is clear that neither Smalley nor Freeman discloses the first and second configurations of the second wellbore casing, as recited in amended independent claims 1 and 6. Claims 2-5 and 19-27 depend from, and further limit, independent claim 1 in a patentable sense and therefore are also not disclosed by either Smalley or Freeman. Similarly, claims 7-10, 28-32 and 35-45 depend from, and further limit, independent claim 6 in a patentable sense and therefore are also not disclosed by either Smalley or Freeman. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to allow all pending claims.

CONCLUSION

The foregoing is submitted as a full and complete Response to the Non-Final Office Action mailed September 18, 2007. Applicant has made a diligent effort to advance the prosecution of the application by submitting claim amendments and arguments in support of the patentability of claims. Applicant has not acquiesced to any rejection and reserves the right to address the patentability of any additional claim features in the future.

As the three-month statutory period for reply expires on December 18, 2007, this Response is therefore considered timely filed and no fees are believed to be due. However, should the Commissioner deem any fees as being due, including any fees for any extensions of time, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to debit said fees from, or to credit any overpayments to, USPTO Deposit Account Number 50-3786, Reference No. 14147.105107.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned via telephone at the number listed below if a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

Respectfully submitted,



Todd Mattingly
Registration Number 40,298

Date: December 17, 2007
King & Spalding LLP
1100 Louisiana Street, Ste. 4000
Houston, TX 77002-5213
Telephone: 713.751.3237
Facsimile: 713.751.3290
E-mail: TMattingly@kslaw.com
USPTO ID 59081